

THE SOUTHERN PRESS.

DAILY, - - - - - \$10 00
 TRI-WEEKLY, - - - - - 5 00
 WEEKLY, - - - - - 2 00

To the People of Tennessee. FELLOW-CITIZENS:

The term for which I was elected to represent you in the Senate of the United States being about to close, I feel it to be no less my duty than my privilege, briefly to submit for your deliberation a consideration of the course I have deemed it my duty to pursue in the discharge of those high and responsible duties. The strong, and I may add violent opposition which was made to my election, and the circumstances attending it, afforded the strongest guarantee that any error of judgment committed by me in the discharge of my official duties would be most promptly and effectually exposed to the public gaze. It is scarcely to be expected that I should, in the many important and responsible votes which I have been required to give, all of which are now on record, subject to your impartial and rigid examination, be exempt from error in every instance. They are before the public for their scrutiny and decision.

I entered the Senate at the first session of Congress held during Mr. Polk's administration, in which session it will be remembered the policy of the Government was changed from the *Whig* to the *Democratic* creed. The recommendation of the President, in his annual message, to change the tariff from *specific* to *ad valorem* duties, and to abandon its *protective* features, thereby leaving it as the framers of the Constitution intended it to be—exclusively a revenue measure, met my entire and hearty concurrence, and received my hearty support, and I have the gratification to believe that I contributed my full share in the passage of the tariff act of 1846.

Pending this session, the war commenced between the Republic of Mexico and the United States; and I presume it is scarcely necessary for me to say that I gave my zealous support, not only to the act recognizing the existence of the war, but also to every measure necessary to its vigorous and successful prosecution. This was closed by a treaty of peace, which also received my support, and which was generally approved by you, that is unnecessary for me to dwell longer on those events.

I therefore proceed to the consideration of the several measures passed at the first session of this Congress. As these measures were most fully and ably discussed by Senator Soule, of Louisiana, I shall give such extracts from his speech as may be necessary to a full understanding of the questions involved. Mr. Soule said:

"It was then first discovered by us of the South, that it was actually necessary for us to ask for a participation in the acquisitions of the Mexican war, and for the constitutional provision in regard to reclaiming fugitive slaves. We had to petition for our rights,—to sue for the protection of interests guaranteed by the Constitution! How have these matters been settled? It is said that the plan of their adjustment is so wise and complete, that to hesitate before submission is treason. This compromise, as it is styled, branches out into five distinct measures. They are—First, the admission of California; Second, the formation of Territorial Governments for Utah and New Mexico; Third, the Fugitive slave bill; Fourth, the abolition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia; and Fifth, the determination of the boundary of Texas.

Let us glance at these several measures: We were just emerging from a successful war,—a war, the great merit of which consisted in the fact that it was conducted with singular ability and energy by a Democratic administration,—a war opposed by the fanatics of the North as most nefarious and unjust. And yet, fellow citizens, when that war had terminated in adding vastly to the territory and wealth of the Union, these fanatics claimed the lion's share of the spoils; and what is worse, they succeeded to maintaining that claim! Without regarding the great sacrifices and noble exertions of the South on the many battle-fields which rendered that war so glorious, let us contemplate the share of pecuniary sacrifices which we are called on to make in that behalf.—The cost of the war was seventy millions of dollars. We bound ourselves in the treaty to pay Mexico fifteen millions, and five millions to our own citizens—making in all, which the people of the Union have to pay in the next ten years, on account of the Mexican war, ninety millions. Out of this, according to the ratio of taxation by the tariff adopted by the General Government, the South will have to pay two-thirds, or sixty millions. To a mercantile community the statement of these facts and figures ought not to be without their just weight.

But, fellow citizens, their demands stop not here. The exhaustion of our pockets, of our means, does not satisfy the ambition of our oppressors; if it ended here, we might congratulate ourselves. If we were only called on to pay two-thirds,—the whole amount, or double, three, four, or a hundred-fold of the expenses of this war, I should counsel submission, rather than endanger the integrity of this Union, the harmony of our people, or the peace of the country. I would say, submit, submit, if such abnegation does not involve also the surrender of your rights, as freemen, of your honor as men, and of your equality in this confederacy of sovereigns. Will I counsel you to submit to that last indignity? No! never! (Loud cheers.)

Under this so-called compromise, California, with boundaries extended over a hundred and fifty-three thousand square miles of territory, not one-tenth of which had been seen by her inhabitants, was admitted into the Union, with the *Wilmot Proviso* embodied in her constitution. On what grounds were these erroneous pretensions based? To answer this question, let us consult the friends, not the opponents of the compromise. It was with the North, California sided; it was to the demands of that section her people hearkened, and it was by their permission and power that she was brought into the Union, because of the clause in her Constitution embodying the *Wilmot Proviso*. True, the South had freely poured out the blood of her sons—had contributed from her scant means, to defray the expenses of the war—had made every sacrifice which high-toned patriotism or honor could suggest, to aid in the acquisition of this territory, yet was she excluded from all its broad extent, and debared of all its benefits.

In vain did we of the South ask for some protection against, or some limitation of

these enormous pretensions. We were voted down. Not satisfied with excluding us from California, they proceeded to shut us out of Utah and New Mexico; by a territorial organization, which if it did not expressly exclude slavery, by placing the matter under the control of a majority of Congress, actually threw us at the mercies of our enemies. It was in vain we demanded your rights; Congress would not protect them. You were asking only an equal share in the territories acquired,—and instead of listening to you, or giving you an inch, they proceeded to deprive the South of 83,000 square miles cut off from the State of Texas, to make more free soil territory, and then compel you to pay \$10,000,000 for the sacrifice. (Loud applause.)

To show you the basis on which Mr. Soule founded his conclusions, I now give you an extract, in which he quotes from Mr. CLAY and Mr. WEBSTER.

Mr. CLAY said: "July 22d, 1850. Senators from the Northern States might go home to their constituents, after this measure shall have passed, and say: 'We have got California, she is sure; why is a prohibition of slavery in her constitution that will last perhaps forever; whereas, the *Wilmot Proviso* had here had limited and evanescent duration, existing while the territorial form of government remained, but ending whenever the State should come to form for herself a constitution.' This our Northern senators might say with great propriety to their constituents. 'We have secured California for you, she is dedicated now and forever to that free-soilism which you so much prize.' Well, but why, then, they might reply, have you not put in a restriction on the territorial bill, so as to secure that, at least, until they become to be ripe enough to form State governments for themselves?—Would it not be a satisfactory reply to them to say, that in your opinion, and in the opinion of a large portion of the Senate—the *law of nature* and *nature's God* excluded slavery from these territories, and according to your own opinion also, the *lex loci* of the land also excluded slavery."

"Therefore you forbore to vote against the final measure, because it secured so much of what the North wanted! Could you not say that you were in danger of losing what you also wanted in respect to the residue of the country?"

"The North gains the admission of California as a free State, and the high probability of New Mexico and Utah remaining or becoming free territory; avoids any introduction of slavery by the authority of Congress; sees New Mexico detached from Texas, with a high degree of probability—from the nature of the climate and the character of the soil, and from other circumstances, that New Mexico will ultimately become a free State, and secure the abolition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia. Are not these objects of sufficient magnitude to satisfy any moderate, rational, Northern wish?"

"What rights are sacrificed? What concession of power and authority is made by the North in this measure?"

"To what power is the sacrifice made here?"

"I ask him what right is sacrificed by the North in this measure? Let him tell me if the North does not get almost every thing, and the South nothing but her honor?"

"Yes, the honor of paying with her money and blood for territory from which she is excluded! And what says Daniel Webster? Hear him also:

"July 18th, 1850. What does she gain by it? What does she lose by it? Why, if this bill passes, Massachusetts, and the North gain what is quite an object to them, the annexation of California as a free State, with her present constitution—a very intensely desirable object, as I believe to the whole North."

She gains that. She gains also, sir, the quieting the New Mexican question, and the Texan boundary, which, in my judgment, as I have said, is the most important of all these matters, because most immediately menacing evil consequences, if such consequences be arrested by this or some similar measure. She gains the quiet of New Mexico—she gains the settlement of the Texan boundary—objects highly desirable.

Now, the question, therefore,—and I address myself to the gentlemen of the North—is this: Is the probability of the exclusion of slavery from New Mexico by natural causes, so high and strong, and conclusive, as that we should act upon it as we act upon the same degree of probability applied to other questions in civil, moral, and social life?"

It is not so, if anything further is necessary to be added to that, here we have laid before us an authenticated expression of the inhabitants of that country, who, it is agreed, on all hands, have the ultimate right of decision upon the subject, that they are opposed to it.

And how is it with the South? Why, I think the South, the slaveholding States, if all these measures pass, will gain an acceptable and satisfactory mode for the reclamation of slaves. As to the territorial acquisitions, I am bound in candor to say, that taking Maryland for example, as one of the South, Maryland will gain exactly what Massachusetts loses,—that it nothing at all. (Loud laughter.)

Thus you have the opinions of these eminent men on that compromise, which we are now told is so favorable to the South. Now, let us consult some other of the great lights of the North. I read from an article, the authorship of which is generally attributed to Mr. Brooks, a representative in Congress for the State of New York:

"From the borders of Missouri to the Pacific Ocean, and from the British dominions there on the north, to Mexico on the south, not a slave is now held, or can be held. Wherever there is a State Government, it is especially prohibited, and wherever there is a territorial government, it is prohibited by the local municipal Mexican law. Congress has not repealed that Mexican law, even amid the most violent Southern effort so to make it do. Congress has not established slavery south of 36° 30', though pressed so to do by the whole united Southern vote. Liberty everywhere, in all our Mexican acquisitions, ally and practically exists. The territory for which Southern blood was shed, as well as Northern blood; for which Southern treasure was lavished, as well as Northern treasure; to which the South had equal rights with the North—ALL IS Ours! Why heap coals of fire on Southern heads? Is it not enough to have the soil free, to have carried everything before us, without reproaching the South more, exasperating it

further, and jeopardizing the very existence of our glorious Union?"

Mr. SOULE then said: "This is the language of a bold man, who speaks out his sentiments in a manly and open manner. 'All is ours,' he says; 'all of that land for which so much Southern blood was shed—so much Southern money spent.' And now, he asks, do not heap coals of fire on the head of the South; do not wrong her further; do not impose further on her patience and submission; put a limit upon your ambition and aggressions. Oh, fellow-citizens, when has the oppressor been satisfied, as long as the oppressed was kneeling before him and asking mercy? But we were told that, although these were grievous wrongs, we must accept to the nation, and that, when such men as Cass, Dickinson and Webster, had declared in their favor, the people would harken, and be convinced."

"With this promise, I read in a speech, delivered a short time ago at Baton Rouge, this pledge, given in regard to the irresistible influence of these great names. What are the facts? How is it in Massachusetts? Webster has lost every point, has been defeated in every direction. His remorseless enemy has been returned to Congress in his own district, against all his influence. And the 'great defender of the Constitution,' with slavery, the Fugitive slave bill, the Compromise, and everything else, has been thrown overboard! How is it with Dickinson in New York? The legislature is overwhelmingly against him, and the great national Union party there means Fish instead of Dickinson. Cass has fared no better. All his influence, backed by the popular compromise, could not re-elect the very worthy and intelligent gentlemen who represented the Detroit district in Congress last year. So much for the weight of these great names!"

"But we are told that we must not doubt that the Fugitive slave bill will be faithfully executed. What are the facts on this point? There have been four attempts to execute this law. Two Georgians went to Massachusetts to claim their property, under the Constitution—under the Compromise. What was their fate? They were three times arrested, put under bonds for \$30,000, and finally compelled to leave the State without their slaves. This is certainly a peculiar mode of executing the Compromise, and manifesting devotion to the Constitution. At Detroit, too, an effort was made by a slaveowner to avail himself of this law. He was pursued by mobs, threatened, put in great peril, and finally compelled to take \$300 for his slave; he would have taken much less, I presume, to get out of the scrape he was in."

There was also a case in Pennsylvania. An owner showed his title to a slave, running through three generations. It was decided that the title was not established. In another case, in New York, three persons came forward and swore the man who claimed the slave had been guilty of perjury. And these, fellow-citizens, are the evidences of the good feeling with which we are assured the North will carry out that bill which constitutes our chief compensation for the concessions of the Compromise. Let me read again from the New York Express, a conservative journal:

"Discontent, however, is now bitter, never so bitter as now, between the two opposing elements of which we speak. The South is sore by losing all political power in our vast Mexican acquisitions, and by seeing the administration of the Government virtually pass from its hands. The North, even amidst its greatest victory ever won over slavery, in the exclusion of slavery from California, and its virtual limitation to the places where it now is, yet refuses to carry out its solemn compact to surrender fugitive slaves; for it is but a cheat for us to say we are opposed to the details of the Fugitive slave law, as we are opposed to the principle itself. The stipulation in the Federal compact is odious, inexecutable as yet, and we are nullifiers in spirit and in fact. Freemen will not be 'slave-catchers,' we are daily told in responsible organs of the public press. SLAVE-CATCHING is unpopular; and to be popular we turn nullifiers, not only of the laws, but of the Constitution itself."

And thus you find the whole North proclaiming that the passage of these bills has killed slavery forever, and yet we, who proclaimed that such was the purpose and object of these measures, and therefore opposed them, are branded as traitors!

But oh! the violence of some of the denouncers of those who stand by the rights of the South—where will it end, when it seeks to trample such men as Quitman and Davis in the dust? These men who have illustrated your national character by glorious exhibitions of courage, heroism, and patriotism, who led the youth of your country to victory on the fields of Monterey, Buena Vista, Churubusco and Chapultepec—these, are now denounced as traitors by the very men who, during the war, invited the Mexicans to welcome them with bloody hands and hospitable graves—the latter are the patriots—the former traitors. [Loud cheers.] Ah! between such traitors and such patriots I cannot hesitate, I am with the patriots! [Long applause—we are with them too!]

But, fellow citizens, I have already detained you too long. (Cries of no! no! Go on! go on!)

This cry of Union—of the National Union party—is a cunningly-devised net, thrown over us by our political adversaries, to catch and hold us. It will only catch those who want to be caught. On this question there are but two parties, a Northern and Southern party. What is the Union this new party wants? They seem to lose sight of the Constitution altogether; it is a dead letter to them; the word is not to be found in their vocabulary. Union! Union! is their only course! I will answer them; it they mean the Union under the Constitution, we are all for it; if they mean a Union out of the Constitution, I for one, am against it. (Applause.) Who are the Unionists? (Cry—"the Whigs," and some confusion.) Are those Unionists who are for the Constitution and the equal rights of the States—who observe the noble principle of asking nothing but what is right, and submitting to nothing that is wrong?

They speak of traitors! There have been two great traitors who are immortalized in our history—the one an immortality of glory, the other an immortality of infamy. The one was George Washington, our first great leader, who, rather than bend his neck to the yoke of despotism, rather than submit to oppression, degradation and dishonor, became a traitor to the British government and

a benefactor to the whole human race. (Loud cheers.) There was no submission in that glorious traitor. His fame will grow brighter with the lapse of time, and unborn generations will hymn his praise. The other great traitor was Benedict Arnold, who betrayed the cause of liberty, bartered his character for filthy lucre, and descended to posterity accursed of all men. Thus is the same name applied to widely different characters and actions.

What shall we do then? What remedy have we? [A voice, "resist."] No—we have not reached the point where we should resist. That can only be when all other remedies are exhausted. Let us be prepared for resistance, when that necessity comes upon us. Let us then with bold hearts and firm resolutions, resist the last sad exigency. But are there not some remedies and securities which honor, dignity, and a just regard for our rights require us to demand? Should we not demand a repeal of the law abolishing the slave trade in the District of Columbia, and erase from the statute book, this surrender of the principle which will serve as a precedent for future aggressions? Unless repealed, what shall we do? [A voice, "transport the negroes."] So say the abolitionists, transport the negroes!

But who is to reimburse the South for three millions of slaves? where are the fifteen hundred millions of dollars to come from? What, too, would become of the people and of the country from which so large a number of laborers are subtracted?

As long as there is a peaceful remedy for our grievances, we should abstain from violent ones. I can only hurriedly sketch such remedies as have suggested themselves to my mind. We must first assert that the late measures of Congress, inflicted wrongs on the South, which must be redressed. Such of these measures as may be repealed, you ought to insist upon being repealed. Of that character is the abolition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia. Moreover, you should demand some compensation for past injuries and wrongs, and some security for the future, some certain guarantee against continued aggression,—something that can give you peace and security in the Union! When you have obtained this justice, then sing psalms to the Union. It, however, you wish to encourage and invite further aggression, if you wish to bring dishonor, disgrace and ruin on the South,—to make our lovely country a Paria in the republic, composed of dependants on the favor of the strong, and suppliants for their rights, then submit to these oppressions, and sink to the level of your slaves, and take their places in the social and political scale! [Loud applause.]

The submissionists claim to be the National Union party. What are the creed and principles of that party, and who are its prominent and leading men North and South. Mr. CLAY, the author of the so called measures of compromise, tells us that no earthly consideration could induce him to vote to extend slavery into territories now free, and he then informs us that the territories acquired from Mexico are free by force of the Mexican laws—then no earthly consideration could induce him to give a vote giving one inch of these territories to the South. In what, then, does he differ on this question, from our most bitter opponents of the North. In this Seward agrees to all of Mr. CLAY's doctrines. They both agree that no earthly consideration could induce them to permit slavery to go to any part of these territories, and their only difference is that Seward desires to make assurance doubly sure by adding the *Wilmot Proviso* to the Mexican law. They agree about the end to be accomplished, to wit: the exclusion of the South. What does it matter to the Southern people, if they are to be excluded from a country acquired by their blood and treasure, whether exclusion be effected by the *Wilmot Proviso*, or the Mexican proviso. I have no more respect for a Mexican than I have for Wilmot—no fact, no respect for either.

Mr. CLAY is the author of the bill to abolish the slave trade in the District of Columbia. When this measure a few years ago was offered by a Northern fanatic, it produced much excitement and a united opposition in the South; but now, as it comes from Mr. CLAY, it is constituted one of the great pillars of the so called "National Union party." Mr. CLAY's bill proposed to purchase a much larger portion of slave territory from Texas to be converted into "free-soil," than did finally receive the sanction of Congress, and he opposed every attempt to reduce the quantity thus embraced in his bill. Is there a fanatic in the North who does not desire to convert slave into free territory. Now, as manifested by these measures, what is the difference between Mr. CLAY's sentiments and views, and those of the "Free-soilers" of the North. These measures are certainly all one-sided and in favor of the North. They are exclusive, sectional, unequal, unjust, and oppressive. By them, the people of the South are excluded unjustly, and I think unconstitutional, from any benefit or enjoyment of a country acquired by the blood of their sons and their treasure. They are also excluded from that section of country purchased from Texas, where slavery was recognized and protected by the Texas constitution. They are now forbidden, under pain of a forfeiture of their slaves, from bringing them to the District of Columbia, there to be kept until removed elsewhere for sale. But we are told that as a full and adequate compensation for this concession and sacrifice of Southern rights, interests, and honor, we have obtained the passage of a law which secures to us our constitutional right of having delivered up to us the slaves who may escape into the non-slaveholding States.

This is no concession to the South, it is a right under the Constitution which all the officers, Federal and State, civil and military, are solemnly sworn to support. It is a melancholy fact, however, that this provision of the Constitution has, in the North, been most shamefully violated by the legislators, who, in disregard of their solemn oaths, have enacted laws to thwart and defeat its execution, and also by the judges, justices, and other officers, in disregarding the provisions of the Constitution, and by giving effect to and enforcing the unconstitutional enactments. Will they do any better now. Will they regard the act of Congress as of any higher authority than the Constitution, or will they not resort to their old tricks, and defeat both the Constitution and the law. Judging from the signs of the times, there can be no doubt of it. But what is the position of Mr. CLAY, the author of this "National Union party," on this subject. "This true that he desires to see the law continued on the statute book and faithfully executed; but in advance, he

notifies the Northern wing of this "National Union party," that if they choose to repeal this law for the re-capture of fugitive slaves, still he and his associates will adhere to and maintain the Union, which will no doubt have the effect of encouraging them to repeal the law."

This would not be the Union created by the Constitution which he and his associates would support and maintain, but it would be a Union built upon the ruins of that sacred instrument of our fathers, for sectional power, aggrandizement, and emolument, to the great degradation, dishonor, and ruin of the South—in other words, it would be a Union without the Constitution, which, for one, I could not sanction nor support, and yet, it would be called "the glorious Union." We had better, I think, look to principle, and cherish, protect, and at all hazards preserve and transmit to our children, improved, if possible, the equality, rights, liberties, privileges and immunities as citizens, which were purchased by the sacred blood of our ancestors—cemented and guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, and transmitted as a legacy to us. This is the Union for which I am willing to fight, and these the great pillars which I most earnestly uphold and zealously support. I do not, therefore, listen to the hypocritical cry of Union!—Union!—glorious Union!—treason!—traitor!—

But there are those who never had any respect for General Jackson, who are now endeavoring to manufacture political capital by distorting his views and sentiments, and we frequently hear them repeating a toast that he once gave—"The Union—it must be preserved." This is a noble and patriotic sentiment, and if used in the sense in which it was given, ought and would receive the highest respect of every patriot in the land. What Union did General Jackson, in this sentiment, mean? Did he not mean the Union created by the Constitution of the United States, and the liberty, equality, and blessings it secures to the American people? Can it be believed that he, under any circumstances, would ever sanction a violation of that Constitution which he had solemnly sworn to support? No—never! Nor would he, under any circumstances, ever support any Union, or any form of government, which did not secure to the States and the people equality of rights, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness. Let the old chief speak for himself. In his farewell address, when speaking on this subject, he said, that:

"Motives of philanthropy may be assigned for this unwarrantable interference, and weak men may persuade themselves for a moment that they are laboring in the cause of humanity, and asserting the rights of the human race; but every one, upon sober reflection, will see that nothing but mischief can come from these improper assaults upon the feelings and rights of others. Rest assured that men, fond busy in this work of discord, are not worthy of your confidence, and deserve your strongest reprobation."

"In the legislation of Congress, also, and in every measure of the General Government, justice to every portion of the United States should be faithfully observed. No free government can stand without virtue in the people, and a lofty spirit of patriotism; and if the sordid feelings of mere self-interest shall usurp the place which ought to be filled by public spirit, the legislation of Congress will soon be converted into a scramble for personal and sectional advantages."

It is true that cases may be imagined disclosing such a settled purpose of usurpation and oppression on the part of the Government as would justify an appeal to arms. These, however, are extreme cases, which we have no reason to apprehend in a government where the power is in the hands of a patriotic people; and no citizen who loves his country would, in any case whatever, resort to forcible resistance, unless he clearly saw that the time had come when a freeman should prefer death to submission."

Why organize a new party? Are both the old political parties profligate and corrupt and therefore not to be trusted, or have they shown a want of patriotism? What can the people of Tennessee do to preserve the Union? She is an interior State. She has a less number of slaves than those Southern States bordering on the Atlantic Ocean, and labor is not so profitable as it is in those States. Has she threatened to dissolve the Union, or shown a want of a proper respect and devotion to the Constitution of the United States? If not, why create a new party in the State to be styled the "National Union Party"? Have the Whig and Democratic parties been broken up and dissolved, or have they lost their national character, and become mere sectional parties, and if so, let us enquire what principle or measure destroyed their national organization and character and reduced them to mere sectional or local parties? Did the South encroach upon the North, or the North upon the South, by which their organization has been dissolved, and their peace, harmony and good feelings broken up and destroyed, so that they cannot again unite. How are all these differences of opinion, bickerings and bitter feelings to be compromised and settled and adjusted, so as to preserve the consistency, the rights and principles of each section, in this so called "National Union Party"? But to return to the point—what can Tennessee do to dissolve or preserve the Union? If the South are to remain divided among themselves by means of this "National Union Party," or by any other means, Northern aggressions on Southern rights will not cease, but will continue until they consummate their nefarious purposes.

If the South would unite and resolve to resist those aggressions, the North would desist, the Constitution and Union would be preserved, and the equality, honor, interest, and rights of the South would be permanently secured. Will this National Union party effect this object? Mr. CLAY, the Southern head of it, is not for resistance, but submission to these aggressions. He, therefore, is for the Union, although the rights of the South, and the Constitution of the United States should be disregarded and trampled under foot by the Northern people. Can he carry the extreme Southern policy with him? If not, his policy in presenting to the North a division in the South will but stimulate and encourage the North to new aggressions, and the extreme South not following in the lead of Mr. CLAY, will prescribe the measure and mode of their resistance, and thus they will secede and dissolve the Union. In all this, Tennessee will have had nothing to do; she may have remonstrated, if you please, against this extreme measure of her Southern sisters, but the deed will have been done, and done against your wishes. What then is to be

done? A grave question is submitted for your action and decision. That is, the Union being thus dissolved, where will you go? Will you fall into line—shoulder your musket, and fight side by side with the Abolitionists of the North for the purpose of whipping your Southern brethren into abject submission to the insults, outrages, and wrongs which it is not necessary here further to characterize and portray. No, fellow citizens! never would Tennesseans thus degrade themselves, and dishonor the graves of their fathers. What, then, would you do?—Would you unite your destinies with the North, in order that they might continue their aggressions on you? Would it be either your interest or policy to do so? Where, may I inquire, are your markets for all your surplus products? Where do you send your pork, horses, mules, grain, &c.? To the North or to the South? Tell me when Tennessee has sold one dollar's worth of her surplus to a free State? I answer—Never! On the contrary, some of the free States compete with you in your own market, and that of the other Southern States. If you attached yourselves to the North, thereby becoming aliens to the Southern Republic, in sending your surplus to that section, you would be required by their revenue laws to pay a duty or tax on them, if, indeed, they would permit you to trade with them at all. Again—what would become of the Mississippi river, and your right to navigate it. I need not, and will not, prosecute this inquiry further. It is too absurd to suppose that you would, in such a result, hesitate a single moment. You would, of course, go with the South, and, if fighting was to be done, you would be found where your fathers were found, in the war of the revolution—on the side of the oppressed, battling for equality, honor, liberty, and right, and there you would find the whole South."

The agricultural interests of the South have been taxed and oppressed long enough by congressional legislation, for the unequal and unjust purpose of enriching the manufacturer of the North; it is therefore high time, that we should foster and encourage our own citizens, in their agricultural and manufacturing pursuits over those who have deprived us of our equality and rights, by imposing a duty or tax on all the fabrics and productions grown or manufactured in the non-slaveholding States, and thus we would accomplish several important objects. This policy it should prevail in all the Southern States, which from present indications I think it will, would give to the South-western States the exclusive market in the Southern States for their flour, pork, grain, horses, mules, &c., &c., to the exclusion of the non-slaveholding States, and it would inevitably enhance the value of those articles considerably and at the same time, it would give encouragement to our people to engage in manufacturing as it would cut off in a great degree Northern competition in the Southern sections of the Union, or at least it would give them the advantage in the market to the extent of the tax. This is not all the benefits of this system of policy. The revenue thus raised would go very far to relieve the people from the onerous taxation now imposed on them and lastly, it would teach the Yankee, that we knew our rights and were resolved to maintain them; and his purse nearest his heart, it would bring him to a sense of justice. There is no section or State whose interest and prosperity would be more promoted by this measure than those of Tennessee. By means of the railroads now being constructed, a cheap and quick conveyance will be afforded the people for the transportation of all their surplus produce into all the Southern States. Will Tennessee, in view of all these advantages, co-operate with the Southern States in this benign, just, and necessary policy, or will she continue to advocate a policy, the effect of which is to enrich the North at the expense and depression of the South. If this policy would not preserve the constitutional Union given us by our fathers, I know of nothing that would, for that Union I am a warm, zealous, and devoted advocate, but if that sacred instrument is to be trampled under foot and the Union of equals among the States and their citizens which it creates, prostrated, I care not whether it shall have been superinduced by a fanatical feeling or from a lust of political power sought and acquired by usurpation, and a plain and palpable violation of the Constitution. The end and the motive are the same, the nefarious purpose of degrading, oppressing and ruining the South. The Union which meets my sanction and support is that Union which gives to the people of every section that equality, liberty, freedom and justice achieved by the blood of our common ancestors in the war of the revolution and by them secured to their descendants, in and by the Constitution of the United States; this is the Union to which I owe allegiance and to no other. It was to secure to you these blessings that I so strenuously contended at the last session of Congress and for nothing more. I did not ask or demand any exclusive privilege for you, I only demanded your equal rights to enjoy the acquired territories and which were so injudiciously and unjustly denied you.

In view of all these aggressions, and in view of the system of policy which it is clear and manifest the North has marked out for their future course, and, as but one course, in my judgment, can put an end to the ceaseless agitation and aggression, and that is union and concert of action on the part of the South, I most earnestly advise you to that union and concert of action with your Southern friends. Resistance is necessary to check the further progress of aggression. I do not mean that I would resort to disunion or secession as the remedy for past aggressions, but I would say, that other measures ought to be adopted and tried before we should resort to such extremities—they should be the last alternative. I would adopt measures of retaliation, by imposing a tax on Northern fabrics and productions. I would not only defeat the protective tariff policy of the North, which prompts them to impose a high tariff not to raise revenue, but to enable them to sell their goods in the South at enormous prices, which impoverish us and enrich them, but I would tax their goods, so as to place them in fair competition with foreign goods, and thus raise a revenue sufficient to support your State government, and relieve the people from all other taxation. In this way you would reach the interest of the Yankee, and in so doing you would touch his heart also. This system would soon bring the North to a sense of justice; but so far from this being the policy of the present administration, we see Mr. FILLMORE, the acting President of the United States, having accomplished his free-soil views at the last session of Congress,

by the passage of the so-called "Compromise bills," seeks now to convert the free-men of the South into slaves for the Abolitionists of the North, by recommending the imposition of a protective tariff or tax on the Southern people, not to raise a revenue to meet the exigencies of the Government, but to enrich the manufacturer of the North. In plain English, he desires to take the proceeds of the labor of the Southern man, and give it to the capitalist of the North.

I have not yet noticed the Northern head of the "National Union party." I am unable to say whether it is WEBSTER or CASS, or some other such man, but he who he may, it is quite certain that he would not be more Southern than the Southern head of the same party.

We are told that the President will see that the Fugitive slave law is faithfully executed—this he has not yet done. But how can he, or will he enforce this law? To do so, he must keep in all the free States a sufficient number of troops to suppress and put down the lawless mobs and insurrections which are so frequently raised to resist and defeat the execution of this law. If the enforcement of laws require a standing army, how distant are we from a military despotism? It is true the resistance to that law is offered mainly by the depraved and profligate, but they are led by those of the highest position, and are opposed by whom? Let the history of recent cases answer. These are the brethren to whom we are required so closely to adhere; but who, there is reason to believe, are in the pay of the British, whose policy and object it is to distract and divide the American people, and finally to overthrow our Government: Thus the alternative is submitted to the South—either to submit to British dictation and control, through their instruments in the North, or to resist the oppression, and to maintain their rights and liberties. That you may see I am not mistaken, I give you the following evidence, contained in a statement which attested me very much when I heard it made by the distinguished senator from South Carolina, (Mr. CALHOUN.) I use it for the purpose of showing the connection of this party of Abolitionists with foreign power. He said:

"Now, sir, I come to Texas. Perhaps no gentleman had more to do with the acquisition of Texas than myself, and I aver that I would have been among the very last individuals in the United States to have made any movement at that time toward the acquisition of Texas; and I go further and say, if I knew myself, I was incapable of acquiring any territory simply on the ground that it was to be slave territory. No, sir, a very different motive actuated me. I knew at a very early period, that the British Government had given encouragement to the Abolitionists who were represented in the World's Convention. The question of abolition was agitated in that convention; and one gentleman stated that Mr. A. Lams informed him that, if the British Government chose to abolish slavery in the United States, they must commence at Texas. A committee from this World's Convention was sent to the Secretary of State. It so happened that this very gentleman was present when the intercourse took place between Lord Aberdeen and that committee, and he gave him a full account of it shortly after that occurrence, stating that Lord Aberdeen fell into the project to give encouragement to the Abolitionists."

If the Union should be dissolved, what will be its effect upon the various States? The South are bound and united together by an indissoluble bond—the institution of slavery—they have a unity of interest, of feeling, and of sympathy, that nothing could rend asunder—they produce sugar, cotton, tobacco, hemp and rice; in a word, they produce all the staple commodities which regulate and control the trade and exchanges between this country and foreign nations. We are told that a dissolution will produce civil war; this is not an argument addressed to our reason and understanding, but to our timidity or fears, and may therefore be termed the "raw-head and bloody bones" argument, which can have no effect upon the worthy and legitimate descendant of our revolutionary sires. But the argument itself is false. If disunion should come, the free States have nothing to bind them together, and they would probably form as many separate republics as there are now States. They would not, and could not unite in the unholy attempt to whip the South into submission. No republican form of government can be held together by the sword and bayonet. This can only be done by monarchs. No free American can ever submit to become the abject slave of tyranny and oppression, come from what quarter it may. No, fellow-citizens, the proud and lofty spirit of '76 will rekindle itself in the hearts of the worthy descendants of their revolutionary sires, and by their stout hearts and strong arms, they will indignantly and resolutely repel and resist any and every attempt to rivet the yoke of oppression upon their necks. But it is not my purpose at present to discuss the effects of a dissolution of the Union. If that sad event ever should come, I will not anticipate it; sufficient for the day is the evil thereof.

If the compromise bills had not passed, the Union would have been in no danger. It was the passage of these bills that alienated the hearts and affections of so many worthy and patriotic men of the South. I labored to prevent this melancholy event and to preserve and perpetuate the Union in the hearts and affections of the people. The only possible mode, in my judgment of giving it stability and perpetuity.

I am censured by some for my course in the Senate of the United States during the last session of Congress upon the slavery question, and I shall content myself therefore by discussing only such questions as may seem to effect my integrity of purpose, consistency or patriotic motives.

Will the North execute in good faith the so called "Compromise"? They have obtained the whole of the territory acquired from Mexico to Free-soilism. They have acquired enough of slave territory from Texas to make two more free States, and they have abolished the slave trade in the District of Columbia. All these are concessions to the North. Having obtained all this, will they now act as American citizens and abide by the plain letter of the Constitution of the United States and the laws passed in pursuance thereof, or will they in violation of both continue their interminable agitation and warfare upon the institutions of the South? Will they execute, in good faith, the Fugitive slave law? I did not before the passage of these measures, nor do I now, believe, we are to have peace and quiet; on the contrary I fear the passage of these measures will give